AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The replacement sheet of drawings attached hereto includes changes to FIG. 2 and FIG. 5. This sheet, which includes FIG. 2 and FIG. 5, replaces the original sheet including FIGS. 1-5. In FIG. 2, the cross hatching has been changed to address the Examiner's concerns of improper cross hatching. FIG. 5 has been separated into FIGS. 5A, 5B, and 5C, to address the Examiner's concerns of multiple views in one figure. In addition, extraneous writing has been removed from the drawing.

LAW OFFICES OF CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESSPLLC 1420 Fifth Avenue Suite 2800 Seattle, Washington 98101 206.682.8100 <u>REMARKS</u>

Applicant thanks Examiner Amiri for the analysis set forth in the Office Action.

Election/Restriction

Applicant hereby confirms the provisional election made in the telephone conversation of

April 26, 2007, with Examiner Amiri, that being of the species of Group I, FIGS. 1-2, Claims 1,

and 3-7. Applicant retains the right to present Claims 8 and 9 in a divisional application. Applicant

notes that the Examiner has taken the time to examine Claim 2. Applicant has, therefore, retained

Claim 2 in the application.

Drawings

In the amended drawings, the cross hatching concerns in FIG. 2, multiple views in FIG. 5,

and extraneous writing on the drawing sheet have all been addressed.

Specification

The title has been amended to refer to the specific application for the shear coupling in oil

well pump strings.

Upon reviewing the published application, Publication No. 20040202521, published

October 14, 2004, the errors noted in the specification relate to the misspelling of the word

"statement" and in paragraph [0014] appear to have already been addressed. In any event, the text

at the beginning of page 2 has been deleted.

In order to address the Examiner's drawings objection regarding multiple views in FIG. 5,

paragraphs [0014] and [0016] have been amended.

Claim Objections

Applicant has amended Claims 1, 2, 3, and 4 as proposed by the Examiner.

LAW OFFICES OF CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESSPLLC 1420 Fifth Avenue

Suite 2800 Seattle, Washington 98101 206.682.8100

-7-

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 3 has been amended to specify that a corrosion preventing coating is on a surface of

the groove. Claim 4 has been amended to specify that a corrosion preventing coating is on a surface

opposite the groove. Claims 1 and 2 have been amended to be open-ended.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claim 1 presently stands rejected as being anticipated by Strizki. Claims 5, 6, and 7

presently stand rejected as being anticipated by Dent. As noted by the Examiner, Strizki and Dent

weaken the coupling by creating a narrowing which serves as a frangible connection, which will

shear when subjected to stresses beyond a given stress. This frangible connection would appear to

be positioned in a solid portion of the coupling. In contrast, the teaching of the present invention is

to place the groove providing the frangible connection on the larger hollow cylindrical portion. To

duplicate the present invention, Strizki would have to move his frangible connection to that portion

labelled 32 and Dent would have to move his frangible connection to one of the components

labelled in FIG. 2 as 36 or 38. In order to make his invention work, Dent closes the bore so it no

longer provides a passage through the body and places his frangible connection on a solid portion

that connects two hollow cylindrical halves.

The shear coupling of the present invention must withstand both a pulling or lifting load and

a torque load. While Strizki and Dent might be able to withstand pulling or lifting loads, it is

respectfully submitted that they would be unable to withstand the torque loading in a well pump

string application that involves a rotary pump. This aspect of the invention is discussed in

paragraph [0006] of the application as filed. This difference has been emphasized in the

amendment to Claim 1, which focuses upon a weakening of the larger diameter cylindrical hollow

portion of the body. This difference has also been emphasized in the amendment to Claim 2, which

notes that the entire body is hollow with a bore that extends therethrough.

LAW OFFICES OF CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESSPLLC 1420 Fifth Avenue Suite 2800

Suite 2800 Seattle, Washington 98101 206.682.8100

-8-

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3 and 4 presently stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over Dent in view of Mudge Jr. As noted by the Examiner, the Mudge Jr. reference has been cited for the purpose of demonstrating that coatings with a protective corrosion barrier is known. It is respectfully submitted that Mudge Jr. does not make up the deficiency in the Strizki and Dent references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and arguments, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in a condition for allowance. With the allowance of Claims 1 and 2, withdrawn Claims 8 and 9 should be rejoined. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESSPLLC

Kevan L. Morgan Registration No. 42,015 Direct Dial No. 206.695.1712

KLM:jlb